

REMARKS

This paper is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated May 1, 2007, within the three-month period for response. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the subject Office Action, claims 1-12, 14-32 and 34-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,535,227 to Fox et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,107,534 to de Jong et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,384,842 to DeKoning et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections to the extent that they are maintained. Applicants have canceled claims 5-7, 17, 27-29, 36 and 42-45, and amended claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 23, 30 and 40, and Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is being added by the above amendments, as the amendments are fully supported in the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. In addition, as the amendments essentially incorporate subject matter previously recited in other dependent claims, Applicants submit that no new issues are raised by these amendments, so they are properly considered after final.

Applicants also note that the amendments made herein are being made only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the aforementioned claimed subject matter. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the originally claimed subject matter is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue this and other subject matter in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Now turning to the subject Office Action, specifically to the rejection of independent claim 1, this claim has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 5, 7, 17 and 44. Claims 5-7, 17 and 44 have been canceled, and claims 8-10 have

been amended, for consistency with the amendments made to claim 1. Claim 1 therefore additionally recites the following additional concepts:

- each of the plurality of hardware components is associated with at least one attribute;
- indicating the selected status includes: (1) selecting a filter criterion from a plurality of predetermined filter criteria, each of the plurality of predetermined filter criteria associated with a predetermined view among a plurality of views; (2) comparing attributes associated with the plurality of hardware components against the selected filter criterion; and (3) selecting those hardware components associated with attributes that match the selected filter criterion, wherein the pictorial representation continues to depict at least one non-selected hardware component after such selection;
- dynamically retrieving the list of available management operations is performed after indicating the selected status for the multiple hardware components;
- the list of available management operations includes only management operations that are appropriate for being performed on all of the multiple hardware components having a selected status;
- displaying the list of available management operations within a context sensitive menu after indicating the selected status for the multiple hardware components; and
- the management operation is performed responsive to user input directed to the context sensitive menu.

Consequently, claim 1 now covers a scenario where a user selects a filter criteria that is associated with a view from among a plurality of views, which results in that filter criterion being applied to select those hardware components having attributes that match the filter criterion. As a result of this selection, the pictorial representation indicates the selected status of the selected hardware components, while still displaying non-selected hardware components. Then, after the selected status is indicated on the pictorial

representation, a list of available management operations, which includes only those operations that are appropriate for being performed on all of the selected hardware components, is dynamically retrieved and displayed within a context sensitive menu. A management operation is then performed in response to user input directed to the context sensitive menu.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner continues to rely on Fox and de Jong, but now adds DeKoning. With respect to the subject matter of claim 7, which has been added to claim 1, the Examiner argues that Fox discloses selecting a filter criteria from among a plurality of filter criteria, citing cols. 8-9. However, this passage in Fox, which relates to Figs. 8A and 8B, discloses configuration dialogs that are displayed for the purpose of setting security and other parameters for a single node in the Fox system. Neither dialog box is directed to selecting nodes, much less doing so based upon one of a plurality of filter criteria associated with different “views” as is recited in claim 1. In addition, Fig. 9, which illustrates the result of establishing a security posture for a system, illustrates coloring nodes based upon security risk. This highlighting of nodes, however, does not occur for the purpose of “selecting” a node for performing a management operation thereon, so Applicants submit this highlighting is not of user selected nodes. Consequently, Applicants submit that Fox does not disclose or suggest the selection of a filter criterion from among a plurality of filter criterion associated with different views, comparing attributes of components against the filter criterion and selecting those components that match the filter criterion, as required by claim 1. In addition, Applicants can find no similar disclosure in either of de Jong or DeKoning, so Applicants submit neither reference adds anything to the rejection in this regard.

With respect to the subject matter of claims 17 and 44, which have also been incorporated into claim 1, the Examiner argues that Fox discloses a context sensitive menu in Fig. 8 and col. 3, and that de Jong, Fig. 29 discloses performing a management operation on all of the multiple hardware components selected in response to user input directed to the context sensitive menu. The disclosure in Fox, however, is directed to a

395932-1 SSTINEBR

single node, as noted above, so Fox does not disclose or suggest a context menu that is displayed with a list of available management operations that are appropriate for being performed on multiple hardware components having a selected status. Furthermore, there is nothing in the reference that suggests the dialog boxes in Fox are dynamically generated to include management operations suitable for being performed on multiple selected hardware components, or that the dialog boxes are generated after multiple components have been selected by a user.

In addition, with respect to Fig. 29 of de Jong, it should be noted that this figure displays a dialog box where a user is permitted to select drives from a list of drives displayed in the dialog box, and then perform operations such as adding or removing drives to or from an array, designating drives as spares, and building an array from the assigned drives. Claim 1, however, recites that both the dynamic retrieval of the list of available management operations, and the display of the list of available management operations in the context sensitive menu, occur after indicating the selected status for the multiple hardware components. Applicants can find no disclosure in Fig. 29 of de Jong, or elsewhere in the reference, where a list of management operations is retrieved, and a context menu displayed, after drives are selected by a user. Instead, drives are selected by a user after the dialog box is displayed, and there is nothing in the reference that indicates that the types of operations that can be performed in that dialog box (e.g., unassigning a drive, using a drive as a spare, adding a drive to an array, or building an array) are dynamically generated, much less dynamically generated after the user has selected one or more drive icons from the dialog box. Instead, it appears that the operations that can be performed in the dialog box of Fig. 29 are static in nature, and are not dynamically generated. In this regard, the dialog box of Fig. 29 is not even “context sensitive” in nature, as the dialog box is simply a statically-defined set of operations capable of being performed on all drives.

As with Fox and de Jong, DeKoning also appears to lack any disclosure or suggestion relating to the concept of dynamically retrieving a list of available

management operations suitable for multiple selected hardware components, and displaying the list of available management operations in a context sensitive menu, after indicating a selected status for the multiple hardware components. Accordingly, DeKoning adds nothing to the rejection in this regard.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the combination of references cited by the Examiner fails to disclose or suggest the aforementioned features recited in claim 1. In addition, the Examiner has presented no objective reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the proposed combination to incorporate these features. Accordingly, claim 1 is non-obvious over Fox, de Jong, DeKoning, and the other prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, and of claims 2-4, 8-12, 14-16 and 18-22 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Next with regard to independent claims 23 and 40, each of these claims has been amended in a similar manner to claim 1¹, and as such, each of these claims is novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record for the same reasons as presented above in connection with claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 23 and 40, and of claims 24-26, 30-35 and 37-39 which depend therefrom, are therefore respectfully requested.

Next, with regard to the rejection of independent claim 42, this claim, along with claim 43, has been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, or which might otherwise further this case onto allowance, the Examiner may contact the undersigned at (513) 241-2324. Moreover, if any other charges or

¹ Claims 27-29, 36 and 45 have also been canceled, and claim 30 has been amended, for consistency with the amendments made herein to claim 23.

credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

August 1, 2007
Date

/Scott A. Stinebruner/
Scott A. Stinebruner
Reg. No. 38,323
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.
2700 Carew Tower
441 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
Telephone: (513) 241-2324
Facsimile: (513) 241-6234